FILEBYTH WILL OF OF 54USIC THE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

KENNETH HUDDLESTON,)		
	Petitioner,)))	Civil No.	06-671-TC
V.)	ORDER	00 071 10
BRIAN BELLEQUE	Respondent.)))		

Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Coffin filed Findings and Recommendation on May 25, 2006, in the above entitled case. matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the magistrate judge's report. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc.,

656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), <u>cert</u>. <u>denied</u>, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Petitioner has timely filed objections. I have, therefore, given <u>de novo</u> review of Magistrate Judge Coffin's rulings.

I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Coffin's Findings and Recommendation filed May 25, 2006, in its entirety. The petition(#1) is denied without prejudice. Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel is denied as moot. This proceeding is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this

day of

2006.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE